

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed January 13, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 49-59, 65-76 and 81 and objected to claims 63, 64, 79 and 80.

Claims 63, 64, 79 and 80 were objected to because they depend on canceled claims 61 and 77 respectively. The Examiner correctly treated the dependent claims as if they were dependent from independent claims 49 and 75 respectively. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner and have corrected the claim dependencies accordingly in this response.

Claims 49-55, 59, 65-71, 75 and 81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,757,771 (“Li”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,316 (“Epps”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,414 (“Winter”).

Claims 56, 57, 72 and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Epps and Winter and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0141427 (“McAlpine”).

Claims 58 and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Epps and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,014 (“Tezuka”).

Claims 63, 64, 79 and 80 were objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims. The Examiner further stated that the objected claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter.

II. Status of Claims

Applicant previously cancelled claims 1-48 and added claims 49-81. Claims 60-62 and 77-78 had also been previously cancelled.

In this response, claims 49, 64, 65, 80 and 81 have been amended and claims 63 and 79 have been cancelled. As such, claims 49-59, 64-76, and 80-81 are currently pending, of which claims 49, 65 and 81 are independent.

III. Response to Objections of claims 63, 64, 79 and 80

Claims 63, 64, 79 and 80 were objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims. The Examiner further stated that the objected claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and intervening claims.

In this response, the limitation of claim 63 has been added to independent claim 49 and claim 63 has been cancelled. Because claim 49 now includes all the limitation of claim 63, which was previously indicted by the Examiner to be allowable, claim 49 is now allowable. Claim 64 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 49 and is thus allowable as well.

Similarly, the limitation of claim 79 has been added to independent claim 65 and claim 79 has been cancelled. Because claim 65 now includes the limitation of claim 79 that has previously been indicted by the Examiner to be allowable, claim 65 is now allowable. Claim 80 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 65 and is allowable as well.

IV. Remaining Pending Claims 50-59, 64-76 and 80-81 are Allowable

Claim 81 has also been amended to mirror the amendment to claim 49. As such, claim 81 is allowable.

Finally, the remaining pending dependent claims 50-59, 64-76 and 80 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend from the allowable dependent claims 49 or 65.

V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the remarks above, pending claims 49-59, 64-76, and 80-81 are allowable over the cited references. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdraw of the current rejections. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 312 913-2134 with any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: June 14, 2010

By: / George I. Lee /
George I. Lee
Registration No. 39,269